

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

An adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Mary Lee Rosenbaum at 7:02 p.m., **Wednesday, March 16, 2005**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director
Cathy Johnson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Dept.
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-05-13 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02 05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK)

Director Woldruff suggested that the Planning Commission first review the redline comments by the Commissioners regarding both Specific Plans and then open the public hearing after their discussion.

Director Woldruff announced that the Planning Commission needed to schedule a second meeting in April to continue their discussion because the agenda for the April 6, 2005 meeting was very full.

Chair Rosenbaum asked if the Environmental Impact Report for the two projects would be reviewed at that second meeting in April. Director Woldruff replied that it would be and added that one of the items would be the Hillside Designation of the Land Use Element of the Draft General Plan. She stated that the draft text would be completed either Thursday, March 17, 2005 or Monday, March 21, 2005 and would be distributed to the Commissioners in plenty of time for them to review it before the meeting.

Following a brief discussion, the Planning Commission decided on April 20, 2005 to address the University Village/Orchard Park Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Interim Senior Planner Johnson proceeded with the staff report stating that the February 16, 2005 meeting had been reserved for consideration of the entire Orchard Park Specific Plan document. She reported that Holland Partners had given a PowerPoint presentation of the Orchard Park Specific Plan and answered the Commission's questions. She added that the Planning Commission had received public testimony on the Plan.

Ms. Johnson went on to report that the Planning Commission continued the item to the March 16, 2005 meeting at which time the Commissioners would provide redline comments on both Specific Plans that would be submitted to City Staff for compilation into a table for discussion and review purposes. She stated that the goal of the meeting was to review those comments and formulate the items of consensus into recommendations that could be forwarded to the City Council.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion regarding the comments on University Village. She advised that the Commission should focus on the recommendations that they wish to forward to City Council and each member should highlight any particular topic they wished to see changed to help formulate the recommendations. Attorney Holdaway also recommended that the Commission get a consensus on particular topics as they discuss them so that a list of recommendations could be more easily compiled to present to City Council.

Comments were made on the following topics but no action was taken.

- Traffic Impact Analysis – Will be addressed in their EIR, which would be discussed on April 20, 2005;
- Historic Mission Overlay District and where does the ordinance come in regards to the Hierarchy of Regulatory Authority – Director Woldruff explained that it would be placed in the Zoning Plan adopted by ordinance and the applicant would be required to comply with the ordinance. Attorney Holdaway added that when the City Council adopted the Specific Plan an interpretation of the ordinance would be included;
- Setbacks – Ensure that they are large enough so that house footprints do not crowd side yard setback;
- Walls & Fences – Streetscape – Mitigate the tall wall/fence next to the trails to make the trails pedestrian friendly such as a mural or stamped concrete to beautify the walls. Mr. Gil Prestwood, Lewis Operating Corp. explained that the walls would be placed on lots that are open to a street and where the backyard faced the street. He added that he liked the idea of decorating the wall or placing a bench with a shade tree or embellishments. It was suggested that a historic logo be stamped into the wall to let people know that they are traveling in a historic area of Loma Linda;

- Affordable Housing – Requirements met by the Senior Housing portion of the project. Director Woldruff explained that the Affordable Housing issue would also be addressed by the Redevelopment Agency through a Development Agreement;
- Corner Lots – Make them one-story to aid in scale and massing;
- Phasing Schedule – Request for the first phase to be the commercial uses. – Director Woldruff explained that because the residential uses would not be in place to support the commercial, it was not practical to begin with those uses;
- University Village Style Selection – 1) Preference for Spanish/Spanish Colonial, 2) American Farmhouse Style – De-emphasize the garage, 3) Finishes appropriate to style architecture on all four sides of the units, 4) Maintain vertical divided windows on all elevations;
- Trees – Require 24” boxes or larger for all trees throughout the whole project, not only single-family development areas.

The Planning Commission continued their review of each Commissioner's comments as compiled by staff and provided the following comments and recommendations:

Page 24, Section 2.2.4 Aesthetics, third paragraph, second line from the bottom, "... minimizing traffic impacts on lower density residential neighborhoods to the south and add the words "within the project" at the end of the sentence.

Page 24, same section, replacing Homecoming with something with lower density and/or moving the Senior Apartments closer to commercial uses and parks to make it easier on the senior population.

Page 29, Section 3.1.1, in the event that a school does not get built, replace it with lower density use or amenities such as: 1) a library, 2) open space, like a park or an amphitheater, or 3) single-family residences at 4.5 du/acre.

Page 31, Exhibit 7, 1) Modify Homecoming to possible "for sale" products that would include row homes or attached dwellings. The Planning Commission was not in favor of the Homecoming portion of the project because it was not in keeping with the Historic Mission Overlay District and the density was too high; and, 2) Increase commercial area square footage by bringing commercial south along Bryn Mawr.

Page 33, Section 3.1.5, first paragraph insert in last sentence "easily" accessible by foot and bicycle.

Page 33, Section 3.1.5, explore supermarket in commercial area such as a Stater Brothers, Vons, or Trader Joe's.

Page 35, Section 3.1.8, Central Park – Add "shady places for benches, etc."

Page 35, Section 3.1.8, Community Park/Recreation Area – Add language to say that the amenities would be designed for all residents of University Village.

Page 35, Section 3.1.7, Historic Oaks – Consider separate ingress/egress from Redlands Boulevard with parkway along the roadways and a parkway between the roads to preserve as many trees as possible in place with the cost to be share equally by University Village and Orchard Park.

Page 36, Exhibit 8, Recommendation to “Add a pedestrian crossing at ground level or pedestrian bridge crossing to provide connected trail system from the channel south to the hills.”

Page 38, Section 3.2.1, third paragraph recommendation to “Implement new public transportation service as discussed with Orchard Park to provide transportation to and from medical centers in downtown Loma Linda.”

Page 39, Section 3.2.1, in regards to the circulation system, “Connection with existing neighborhood west of project area. Explore possible interior road connection west of the Petersen tract to 1) provide access for children to attend school in project safely; and, 2) some arrangement for travel to public park and commercial area.”

Page 43, Exhibit 11, Mitigate the tall wall/fence next to the trails to make the trails pedestrian friendly such as a mural or stamped concrete to beautify the walls.

Page 56, Table 2, Change language to say: “Include 1-story housing types in all housing categories.”

Page 90, 5.2.5, Articulation of Buildings – 1) Fifth bullet - Change language to say: “No building ‘ends’ and blank, unadorned facades oriented towards public view; 2) Add an eighth bullet – to require a specific percentage of one-story homes to be included in every project.”

Director Woldruff suggested that the Planning Commission allow the project applicant, Lewis Operating Corporation to make his presentation to let the Commission know how he planned to address their concerns.

Commissioner Sakala recommended that the project be restricted on the number of Spanish style houses included in a development. Director Woldruff suggested the following language: “Styles be implemented in a balanced fashion throughout each development area so that there would be representation of at least three or more different styles.”

Gil Prestwood, Representative of the applicant Lewis Operating Corp. thanked the Planning Commission for taking the time to read the document and provide their comments and thanked staff for the compilation. He stated that he would like to bring back a comprehensive presentation that would reflect the Commission’s comments on both the Specific Plan and the Environmental Impact Report.

Commissioner Umeda stated that he was having a problem with the process especially the format because it doesn’t allow for a free exchange of ideas. He suggested that a workshop setting, which would be less formal, could be more productive in the review of the Specific Plans allowing the public to benefit from the process. Mr. Prestwood agreed with Commissioner Umeda that a workshop might help to expedite the process.

Before proceeding with the discussion, Chair Rosenbaum explained that that she would open the public comment period for the University Village project before discussing how the Planning Commission would like to proceed with the rest of meeting. She asked Mr. Prestwood if he would wait until after the public hearing to make any further statement regarding the Commission’s comments. Mr. Prestwood concurred.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 9:05 p.m.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda stated that he thought that the developer's intent was to propose a residential project with some commercial when the City of Loma Linda really needed commercial development. He commented that in his opinion the project should be directed towards commercial development first to create another type of downtown, followed by cultural development alongside the HMOD to help identify the origins of the City of Loma Linda and residential as the last stage of development.

He presented the following additional comments:

- Density and the land use is still inappropriate for this area;
- Under the current General Plan most of the area was designated as commercial, a much needed resource that Loma Linda needed to compete for income with other cities. If the allowable land uses were changed, Loma Linda's ability to create a broad tax base to support the citizens of Loma Linda would be greatly reduced or even lost. The revenues from the proposed commercial areas would not pay for the projects themselves;
- Despite the traffic studies, a reasonable person's assessment concerning traffic caused by adding about 3,000 units translated in an increase in population of about 38% and approximately 6,000 additional cars resulting in 27,000 trips per day based on 4-10 trips that a household made every day. He added that the Redlands Boulevard/California Street intersection would also be greatly impacted;
- The Specific Plans did not meet the requirements of the Historic Mission Overlay District ordinance;
- The request for the approval of high density did not transfer into additional open space, especially that some of the land was City-owned.

Mr. Gallant concluded his remarks stating that the projects must be denied along these lines because strategically, the projects did not fit Loma Linda's vision or future. He added that the Planning Commission should not let these neighborhood creators be city destroyers.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda stated that he agreed with Mr. Gallant's comments and the Planning Commission should deny any residential development in this commercial zone. He commented that the Planning Commission had a financial and fiscal responsibility, a responsibility of good stewardship to the citizens of the City of Loma Linda regarding this land. He continued to say that the land was in the Redevelopment Area (RDA) and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) and that was being proposed would not be sufficient to support police and fire protection because the debts of the RDA and IVDA were reimbursed.

Chair Rosenbaum briefly interrupted Mr. Zirkle to remind the Commissioners that the fiscal impacts of any project in the City were not the purview of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Umeda added that Mr. Zirkle's comments were wrong in regards to the IVDA, and the RDA, and wondered where Mr. Zirkle had obtained his facts. He suggested that Mr. Zirkle also carry out a more thorough research regarding the tax increment/assessment that related to the RDA and the IVDA.

Mr. Zirkle continued and commented on the following points:

- 78 acres in the area were owned by public agencies of the City and there were no reasons that the Planning Commission should develop to the maximum density;

- Vertical Mixed-use was inappropriate for the area and not family-friendly and that the type of project tended to be in the rundown areas of large cities;
- Traffic inconsistent with General Plan Update;
- Rural – Loma Linda is a suburban town and the project areas exceeded even suburban densities;
- Calculation on park acreage was inaccurate;
- A certain amount of uniformity of style was a good thing but what the projects were proposing were the same buildings with very minimal architectural differences from house to house.

Commissioner Umeda asked Mr. Zirkle to name a large development in the last 10-20 years that would illustrate what he was recommending to the Planning Commission. Mr. Zirkle could not identify one at that time. He cautioned the Commission that development demand was very high and that the Planning Commission needed to provide specific requirements or any type of development could happen. He concluded his statement recommending that the Commission eliminate high densities and request single-family residences on large sized lots.

David Werner, 11469 Campus Street, Loma Linda commented as follows:

- Some speakers made general comments about facts and concepts that do not apply to Loma Linda;
- Rural was not a farm setting;
- Liked the idea of new public library;
- Distributed a newspaper article by Dr. John Husing, an Inland Empire Economist given at the Riverside Chambers of Commerce at their recent Good Morning Riverside Event.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda thanked the Commission for taking the time to discuss the project. She also thanked Commissioner Christianson for pointing out that Mission Road was not a minor road. She continued to say that the Historical Commission had talked about the preservation of an orange grove within the City as a historical point of interest and that she recommended that the City keep the 70-acre orange grove that it owned. Ms. Hodgkin also thanked the Commission for thinking of preserving the oak trees. She concluded her statement by informing the Commission that she had a 196-signature petition from current residents that indicated that they thought that 98 houses on 10 acres was way too many, so it would follow that 3,000 on 300 acres would be inappropriate also.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 9:35 p.m. and called for a brief recess.

The meeting resumed at 9:50 p.m.

Before the discussion resumed, Director Woldruff suggested that the Planning Commission entertain the possibility of letting Mr. Prestwood respond to the Commission's comments, then continue the project to March 30, 2005 to allow equal time to Orchard Park to give their presentation. She added that the review of the EIR was scheduled for April 20, 2005 and once the comments on each project had been collected, the Planning Commission could schedule a public workshop.

Chair Rosenbaum invited Mr. Prestwood to make his presentation and Mr. Prestwood replied that the slides that he had planned to present would not be beneficial at this time because they did not reflect all of the Planning Commission's suggestions and recommendations.

Commissioner Christianson directed a question to Mr. Prestwood commenting that Mr. Swails had indicated at a previous meeting that he felt that the project was good and that Lewis Operating Corporation would go with it and asked Mr. Prestwood if he had talked with Mr. Swails about it and if they were willing to change the lot sizes. Mr. Prestwood replied that they were close to what the Commission wanted such as the 8,000 to 10,000 square foot lots on Mission Road and that the land plan would be revised but that the lot sizes north of Mission Road would not be changed. He added that products designed for larger lots were more expensive to build.

Commissioner Christianson commented that the lot sizes and density were major hurdles. Director Woldruff responded that the Planning Commission and the applicant may not agree on all the changes but the Commission should make its recommendations on matters they would like to see and on the things they don't like.

Commissioner Sakala asked if the project could be denied based on the request for the zone change alone if the Planning Commission considered the proposed zoning inappropriate for the area. Director Woldruff replied that the applicant must be given time to present his complete project and allowed due process. She added that the Commission did not have to approve the project and could assemble comments to arrive at a consensus that could be prepared as recommendations to be forwarded to City Council.

Attorney Holdaway concurred with Director Woldruff and stated that the Planning Commission had delegated authority from the City Council to review projects and make appropriate recommendations and although there was no specific deadline for the approval of Specific Plans, the duty of the Planning Commission was to move the approval process forward in a timely manner with or without a favorable recommendation for the project.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to continue the discussion on General Plan Amendment (GPA) Nos. 02-02 and 02-05, Zone Change (ZC) Nos. 02-02 and 02 05, Specific Plan (SP) Nos. 02-08 and 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK) to March 30, 2005 for discussion and comments on the Orchard Park project.

Director Woldruff explained that a notice would be sent to the Community Development Department email distribution list and that the notice would be posted on the City's website and in the usual public places.

Chair Rosenbaum thanked staff for their patience and stated that they appreciated Attorney Holdaway's continued guidance.

PC-05-14 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 6, 2004

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Sakala, and unanimously carried to approved the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 6, 2004 as presented.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There was a brief discussion regarding Historic Mission Overlay District ordinance as it related to the Specific Plans under review for University Village and Orchard Park. Comments were made that the ordinance was vague and subjective and that it did not seem to be compatible

with commercial land uses. Commissioner Christianson suggested that the City Council, the Historical Commission and the Planning Commission meet to determine the scope of the ordinance. Attorney Holdaway stated that the issue could not be discussed because it had not been agendized. He added that the Chair could direct staff to place the matter on the agenda.

Commissioner Umeda formally requested that a joint meeting be scheduled with the City Council to review the Ordinance, define the word "rural" and give the Planning Commission guidance as to the implementation of the ordinance. Chair Rosenbaum directed staff to have the item placed on the agenda for the April 12, 2005 City Council meeting.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff stated that the new Senior Planner H.P. Kang would begin on March 28, 2005 and that she was looking forward to working with him.

She also informed the Commission that the revised Hillside Land Use Designation document was being drafted by LSA, Associates and would be provided to the Planning Commission shortly.

Meeting was adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of August 3, 2005.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2005\03-16-05M-app.doc